

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

The term "brace strut" was used in the originally filed translation and appears in the Substitute Specification on page 5, line 17.

Attached herewith is a proposed Replacement Drawing with an arrow indicating the action of one of the slides 9.

Claim 1 has been amended as instructed by the examiner.

Entry of this amendment after final action because it:

1. Clears up purely formal matters.
2. Opens up no new field of search.
3. Places the case in condition for allowance or better form for appeal.

The claims stand rejected on completely new art, namely US 1,167,431 of Raabe and US 4,061,154 of Cox. This rejection basically is aimed at specific structural features of the invention, but not at the action of the combined parts.

More particularly the instant invention has the claimed spring action having a spring strength that only permits a sectoral

inversion and then an automatic reversion of the umbrella in the event of a wind gust. Nothing in Raabe '431 suggest the particular claimed spring action, especially as the Raabe structure is intended as a retrofit, so there is no way to know if the spring ist too stiff or to soft. Cox '154 offers no better teachings in this regard since this reference is merely aimed at a canopy that can be changed easily. Hence it is impossible to know how stiff or elastic the canopy of Cox will be, making any spring action like that claimed impossible to set.

In any case the references make it clear that inversion is to be prevented altogether. With our system partial inversion, that is only of a single sector of the umbrella, is possible. The combined action of the brace strut, ribs, and canopy according to the invention allows this partial inversion with no permanent damage to the umbrella. Nothing in the art suggests designing the umbrella for such partial inversion; instead the goal is to prevent any inversion of any type.

For these reasons the claims in the case define an invention that operates differently from anything seen in or suggested by the cited refernces. Thus all claims are allowable under §102 and §103. Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this

case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

Respectfully submitted,
K.F. Ross P.C.



by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597
Attorney for Applicant

21 November 2007
5683 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: 718 884-6600
Fax: 718 601-1099
Email: email@kfrpc.com

Enclosure: Request for extension (one month)
Replacement Drawing (1 sheet)